

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified application are now respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending, wherein claims 1, 11, 22 and 26-30 have been amended herein. The Office Action rejects each of the claims 1-30 using a variety of rejections including 35 U.S.C. 102(b) under United States patent number 5,442,633 to Perkins et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as "Perkins"), 35 U.S.C. 102(e) under United States patent number 6,215,790 to Voit et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as "Voit"), under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of Perkins and Voit, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the combination of Perkins and alleged admitted prior art.

As recited in claim 1, an IP address of a user in a mobile communications network system includes a location address and a user identifier. According to the specific amendments to claim 1 made herein, the location address is an address which identifies an access link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration, and the user identifier is an identifier which identifies the user. Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' specification (see e.g., page 14, line 10 to page 15, line 11 and Figure 2). By carrying out a routing of a packet by using such IP address, the amount of information to be included in the packet becomes small, and the routing process becomes simple.

In contrast, in Perkins et al., as mentioned in Applicants' response (dated November 15, 2002) to the first Office Action, an IP address is provided to each of an MH 10 and a BAS 12 independently and a routing is performed by using the LSR option of the internet datagram header and by rewriting the destination address of the header. In this method, the amount of information to be included in the header becomes large, and the routing process becomes complicated.

In Perkins et al., the IP address of the MH 10 does not include the location address recited in the claims. Specifically, the IP address of Perkins is not an address which identifies an access link termination node for which a user has carried out location registration. The IP address of the BAS 12 is separate from the IP address of the MH 10.

Therefore, Perkins et al. does not disclose a significant feature of claim 1; namely, that the IP address includes a location address as recited in addition to a user identifier.

Also, to Applicants' knowledge, Voit does not describe how an IP address is configured. Therefore, Voit et al does not disclose this same feature that the IP address has both the location address as recited, as well as a user identifier.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated nor obvious over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination since neither reference discloses an IP address that includes both a location address and a user identifier, where the location address identifies an access link terminal node for which the user has carried out location registration. Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references at least for this reason.

The other independent claims (i.e., Claims 11, 22 and 26-30) recited a similarly structure IP address and are thus also not unpatentable over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination, for at least the reasons provided above for claim 1.

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of these independent claims, and thus are not unpatentable over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination, for at least the reasons provided above for there respective independent claim.

Regarding claims 26 and 28, the Office Action stated that (with reference to column 6, lines 26-38 and Figure 2) Perkins discloses "notifying a domain-name server of an IP address of a user including a location address and a user identifier" and "storing the notified IP address in connection with a domain name of the user in a database".

However, the passage of Perkins referred to by the Office Action only discloses that when the MH 10 moves and notifies the MR 20 of the IP address of the BAS 12 that are currently reachable, the MR 20 stores the IP address of the BAS 12 in connection with the IP address of the MH 10. The IP address of the MH 10 does not include a location address, and the MR 20 does not manage a domain name.

In view of the amendments made herein and in light of these remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicant



**022913**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

AJL:ds  
W:\15689\52\DS0000000522V001.DOC